



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,535	06/06/2001	Jun Shan Wey	004524.P030	7583

7590 07/08/2003
Jan Carol Little
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

DUVERNE, JEAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/876,535

Applicant(s)
Wey et al

Examiner
Jean Duverne

Art Unit
2839



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 16, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2839

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of applicant's argument, the examiner has decided to issue a second non-final office action to explicitly show the structure for single mode fiber connecting to the dole mode fiber.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giaretta et al (US patent US006510265B1) in view of Bristow et al (US patent US005892866A .

In regard to claim 1, Giaretta's device discloses a mode scrambler (see figs 2 and 4-5) comprising a first and second end wherein a single mode optical fiber on xy (see fig.2) is coupled to the first end and a multi-mode optical fiber at 200 coupled to the second end, a gap (see fig. 2: discontinuity. However, Giaretta's device fails to disclose a diffuse in the gap. Bistow's device discloses a diffuse (37) in the gap between the fibers. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the diffuse in the gap such as the one taught in Bistow's for diffracting the single into multiple modes structure for distributing signal transmission in Giaretta's device.

Art Unit: 2839

In regard to claim 9, Giaretta's and Bistow's devices disclose the aforementioned limitations except for the method to scramble an optical signal. Nevertheless, the features recited in the method claims are identical to the limitations in the apparatus claims mentioned above: the method to scramble an optical signal is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. It is considered as an inherent features. Therefore, this limitation has not been given any patentable weight

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-8, 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giaretta et al (US patent US006510265B1) in view of Bristrow et al (US patent US005892866A).

In regard to claims 2-8, Giaretta's and Bristrow's devices disclose the aforementioned limitations but fail to explicitly disclose the material of which the diffuse is made of. It would have

Art Unit: 2839

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the diffuser made with different type of materials, since it has held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter to meet system design and requirement. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

In regard to claims 10-16, Giaretta's and Bristrow's devices disclose the aforementioned limitations except for the method to scramble an optical signal. Nevertheless, the features recited in the method claims are identical to the limitations in the apparatus claims mentioned above: the method to scramble an optical signal is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. It is considered as an inherent features. Therefore, this limitation has not been given any patentable weight.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean Duverne whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 0297 . The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild, can be reached on (703)308-2710. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308 - 7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

Application/Control Number: 09/876,535


Page 5

Art Unit: 2839

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JFD

June 29, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jean E. Duverne", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2839